

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated January 2, 2008, claims 1-50 were rejected. Applicants are canceling claim 23 with this Amendment and Response. Applicants are amending claims 1, 6-9 and 30 in this Amendment and Response.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 4, 11, 13, 28-30 and 49 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 to Sugiyama (hereinafter “Sugiyama”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,721,883 to Katsuo et al. (hereinafter “Katsuo”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A system for printing multimedia data, the system comprising:
a network including a printing system and a network device;
a network interface for receiving multimedia data from the network device;
a media processing system coupled to the network interface to receive the multimedia data and automatically detect coupling of a peripheral device, the media processing system determining a printed representation of the multimedia data and an electronic representation of the time-based multimedia data, wherein the media processing system resides at least in part on the printing system and at least in part on the network device and comprises an embedded multimedia server ;
a printed output system coupled to the multimedia processing system to receive the printed representation, the printed output

system producing a corresponding printed output from the printed representation of the multimedia data;
an electronic output system coupled to the multimedia processing system to receive the electronic representation, the electronic output system producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the multimedia data; and
a peripheral interface coupled to the multimedia processing system to communicate with the peripheral device.

Sugiyama is directed to a video printer and fails to disclose or suggest “a media processing system coupled to the network interface to receive the multimedia data and automatically detect coupling of a peripheral device... and comprises an embedded multimedia server” and “a peripheral interface coupled to the multimedia processing system to communicate with the peripheral device.” Sugiyama merely describes a video printer that received video data, processes it and prints out associated images of the processed video. No where in Sugiyama discloses or teaches a peripheral interface for communicating with a peripheral device or automatic detection of the coupling of the peripheral device. Therefore, Sugiyama also fails to disclose or suggest “a media processing system coupled to the network interface to receive the multimedia data and automatically detect coupling of a peripheral device” and “a peripheral interface coupled to the multimedia processing system to communicate with the peripheral device.”

Katsuo fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama as Katsuo also fails to disclose or suggest “a media processing system coupled to the network interface to receive the multimedia data and automatically detect coupling of a peripheral device... and comprises an embedded multimedia server” and “a peripheral interface coupled to the multimedia processing system to communicate with the peripheral device.” Katsuo merely describes a system for performing parallel processing of images. No where in Katso discloses or teaches

a peripheral interface for communicating with a peripheral device or automatic detection of the coupling of the peripheral device. Therefore, Katsuo also fails to disclose or suggest “a media processing system coupled to the network interface to receive the multimedia data and automatically detect coupling of a peripheral device” and “a peripheral interface coupled to the multimedia processing system to communicate with the peripheral device.”

Claim 30 recites similar limitations and is therefore patentable over the cited references for the same reasons. Also, as claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 28, 29 and 49 are dependent directly or indirectly on claims 1 and 30, all arguments advanced above with respect to claims 1 and 30 also apply to claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 28, 29 and 49. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 28, 29 and 49 are also patentable over Sugiyama and Katsuo, both alone and in combination for at least the reasons recited above.

Based on the above amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 1-2, 4, 11, 13, 28-30 and 49 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claims 3 and 5 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Katsuo and US Patent No. 6,167,033 to Chang (“Chang”). This rejection is traversed. Chang and Katsuo do not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama. As stated above, Katsuo merely describes a system for performing parallel processing of images. Chang merely describes a multi-party network communication system. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 3 and 5 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claims 6-7, 14-15, 22, 31-37 and 39-48 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Katso and US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220988 to Hymel (“Hymel”). This rejection is traversed. Katsuo and Hymel do not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama. As stated above, Katsuo merely describes a system for performing parallel processing of images. Hymel merely describes a method for establishing an interface for controlling an accessory device. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 6-7, 14-15, 22, 31-37 and 39-48 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claims 8-24 and 25 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Katsuo and US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010641 to Stevens (“Stevens”). This rejection is traversed. Stevens does not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Katsuo. Stevens merely describes a portable receiving system for receiving data products and data product information. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 8-24 and 25 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claim 9 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stevens, Katsuo, Hymel and McCarthy. This rejection is traversed. McCarthy does not remedy the deficiencies of Stevens, Katsuo and Hymel. McCarthy

merely describes a life cell for use in a disaster and a filtration system. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claim 10 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Katsuo, Federspiel, Baron and McCarthy. This rejection is traversed. Federspiel and Baron do not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama, Katsuo, and McCarthy. Federspiel merely describes a system for providing adaptable control of an HVAC system. Baron merely describes an automating real-time weather graphics generating system. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claims 12, and 26-27 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Katsuo, and Chino. This rejection is traversed. Chino does not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Katsuo. Chino merely describes an audio sound localization module. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 12, and 26-27 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claim 16 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Katsuo, Hymel, Kleinrock, and Gerber. This rejection is traversed. Kleinrock, and Gerber do not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama, Katsuo and Hymel. Kleinrock merely describes storing digital data on a flash card. Gerber merely

describes storing digital data on an SD disk. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claim 16 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claim 18 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Katsuo, Kimura, Takemasa and Morinaga. This rejection is traversed. Kimura, Takemasa and Morinaga do not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Katsuo. Kimura merely describes selecting between handling devices. Takemasa merely describes a feeder type handling mechanism. Morinaga merely describes a bandolier type handling mechanism. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claim 18 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claims 20-21 and 23 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Katso and Korman. This rejection is traversed. Korman does not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Katsuo. Korman merely describes outputting audio data using a speaker system. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 20-21 and 23 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

The Examiner also rejects claim 38 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Katsuo, Hymel and Shieh. This rejection is traversed. Shieh does not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama, Katsuo and Hymel. Shieh merely describes

removable storage devices. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claim 38 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Therefore, the Examiner has failed to point out any prior art teaching which anticipates or renders obvious the explicit recitation in the language of claims 1 and 30, specifically, “a media processing system coupled to the network interface to receive the multimedia data and automatically detect coupling of a peripheral device” and “a peripheral interface coupled to the multimedia processing system to communicate with the peripheral device.” Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-22 and 24-50, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peter E. Hart, Jonathan J. Hull, Jamey Graham
and Kurt Piersol

Date: May 30, 2008

By: /Kanda Ishihara/

Kanda Ishihara, Reg. No. 56,607
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650)-335-7805
Fax: (650) 938-5200